UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,780	07/12/2001	John Border	PD-201020	1489

7590 10/12/2005	

Hughes Electronics Corporation
Patent Docket Administration
P.O. Box 956
Bldg. 1, Mail Stop A109
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

EXAMINER
ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action *Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief*	09/903,780	BORDER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kaveh Abrishamkar	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>09 September 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
    a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
    b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
    Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because
    (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
    (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
    (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
    (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
    NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
    Claim(s) allowed: *None*.
    Claim(s) objected to: *None*.
    Claim(s) rejected: *1-16,18,20 and 22-34*.
    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *None*.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.

<u>Primary Examiner</u>
AU 2131
10/6/05

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that the CPA (Gelman and Albert), do not teach "terminating the connection." Gelman is directed towards a Performance Enhancing Proxy (PEP) architecture, as is the claimed invention. Gelman teaches that the gateway application listens for TCP connections (unspoofed messages), and once they are identified (identifying step) as such, terminating the connection as a spoofed connection is made between the PEP gateways (column 9 line 66 - column 10 line 8). Furthermore, the applicant argues that the limitation of "restarting a spoofed connection" for the purposes of redundancy is not taught in the combination of Gelman and Albert. Albert teaches a failover scheme involved backup service managers that would continue to provide a specified service (spoofing) to the packets in the event the main serve manager should fail providing uninterrupted service to the enpoints (column 10 lines 24-51). The combination of Gelman is Albert is valid in that both provide applicances that can spoof packets, and therefore, Albert provides a way to provide redundancy switching for an appliance that can spoof packets (Albert column 2 lines 1-9). Therefore, it is asserted that the Albert and Gelman combination provides redundancy switching for gateways that can spoof packets, and the combinatoin is obvious because providing back-up capability is well-known in the art and provides protection against equipment failure/malfunction.